UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/739,132	12/18/2000	Jerry Crawford	NC13989	4832

26343 7590 08/26/2004

STEVEN A. SHAW
NOKIA, INC.
6000 CONNECTION DRIVE
MD 1-4-755
IRVING, TX 75039

EXAMINER	
CHUONG, TRUC T	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2179	14

DATE MAILED: 08/26/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/739,132	Applicant(s) CRAWFORD ET AL.	
	Examiner Truc T Chuong	Art Unit 2179	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *01 June 2004*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-40 and 42-54* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☐ Claim(s) *1-40 and 42-54* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *11*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to Amendment B, filed 06/01/04.

2. Claims 1-40 and 42-54 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 11, 13, 14, 29 and 39 are independent claims. In Amendment B, claims 1, 2, 11, 13, 14, 15, 29, 30, and 39 are amended, and claims 50-54 are new claims. This action is a non-final rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 1-6, 10-11, 13-20, 24-34, 38-40, 42-45, and 49-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Khurana et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,735,489 B1) in view of Henson (U.S. Patent No. 6,167,383).

As to claim 1, Khurana teaches a component Customization and Personalization System (CCPS) comprising:

a computer site comprising an interface (CAD/CAM, col. 1 lines 23-56), said computer site further comprising a set of predetermined designs and images and a graphics server providing graphics tools for enabling a modification of said predetermined designs and images, and for further enabling the creation of new

designs and images (graphical models, col. 3 line 9-col. 4 line 36, and figs. 1, 4 & 6);

a user station (CAD/CAM, col. 1 lines 23-56) coupled to said computer site, said user station comprising:

(a) a user interface for enabling a user to access said graphics server for defining a desired design to be placed on a consumer product (e.g., col. 3 line 9-col. 4 line 36, and figs. 1, 4 & 6); and

(b) a manufacturing subsystem for receiving data descriptive of said desired design, and for manufacturing, at said user station, at least one three-dimensional component of said consumer product to have said desired design (Manufacturing Process of utilizing the CAD/CAM to automated machinery to create a real-world part, e.g., col. 6 lines 23-64);

however, Khurana does not clearly mention that the computer coupled to a central site via a communications network, it is well known in the art and obvious to implement the ability of connecting computers with central/other sites over a communications network when using the CAD/CAM of Khurana to gather more data from other computers throughout the network;

moreover, this limitation clearly shows in Henson's invention, Henson teaches the system communicates over the Internet (e.g., col. 4 lines 35-63 and fig. 2). It would have been obvious at the time of the invention that a person with ordinary skill in the art would want to add the highly desirable feature of using Internet by Henson in the Manufacturing

Process Modeling of Khurana to provide more effective and convenience to the user when searching for related information throughout the Internet.

As to claim 2, Khurana in view of Henson teaches the CCPS of claim 1, wherein said central site further comprises an electronic commerce engine for conducting a financial transaction with the user in order to make an accounting for the manufactured at least one three-dimensional component (Henson, checkout, col. 11 lines 32-52, and figs. 9-10).

As to claim 3, Khurana in view of Henson teaches the CCPS of claim 1, wherein said central site further comprises means for enabling the user to include the desired design into said set of predetermined designs and images (Henson, shopping cart, col. 9 lines 40-55).

As to claim 4, Khurana in view of Henson teaches the CCPS of claim 1, wherein said user interface enables the user to access said graphics server for the purpose of selecting one of said predetermined designs as a desired design (Henson, standard view, col. 9 lines 15-25).

As to claim 5, Khurana in view of Henson teaches the CCPS of claim 1, wherein said user interface enables the user to access said graphics server for the purpose of creating said desired design by modifying at least one of said predetermined designs and images (Henson, system configuration options, col. 6 lines 17-30 and figs. 3A-C).

As to claim 6, Khurana in view of Henson teaches the CCPS of claim 1, wherein said user interface enables the user to access said graphics server for the purpose of creating said desired design by inputting the new design or a new image (Henson, save the cart, col. 9 lines 49-55 and fig. 6).

As to claim 10, Khurana in view of Henson teaches the CCPS of claim 1, wherein said at least one user station comprises a point-of-sale (POS) terminal (Henson, point-of-sale, col. 7 lines 22-38).

As to claim 11, this is a combination of claims 1 and 2. Note the rejections of claims 1 and 2 above.

As to claim 13, Khurana in view of Henson teaches a component Customization and Personalization System (CCPS), comprising:

a central site comprising an interface to the Internet (Henson, Internet Web site, col. 4 lines 35-42), said central site

further comprising a set of predetermined designs and images and an electronic commerce engine for conducting a financial transaction with the user (see claim 2 above); a user station coupled to said central site through the Internet, said user station comprising:

(a) a user interface for enabling a user to access a graphics program for defining a desired design to decorate at least one component of a mobile station (Khurana in view Henson does not clearly show the personal computer is a mobile station; however, it is well known and obvious to implement the functions/features of the personal computer into a general laptop/portable computer or PDA for the user's convenience; therefore, the personal computer (Henson, col. 3 lines 45-55) infers a mobile laptop computer or a mobile device), the graphics program implementing graphics tools for enabling a modification of said predetermined designs and images, and for further enabling the creation of new designs and images (see claim 1 above); and

(b) a manufacturing subsystem for receiving data descriptive of said desired design, and for manufacturing, at said user station, at least one three-dimensional component of said consumer product to have said desired design (see claim 1 above).

As to claim 14, Khurana in view of Henson teaches a component Customization and Personalization System (CCPS) user station comprising:

a user interface for enabling a user to access a graphics subsystem (parent/child relationship, col. 2 lines 48-65, and fig. 3) for defining a desired design to be placed on a consumer product (e.g., col. 3 line 9-col. 4 line 36, and figs. 1, 4 & 6); and

a manufacturing subsystem for receiving data descriptive of said desired design (e.g., col. 3 line 9-col. 4 line 36, and figs. 1, 4 & 6), and for manufacturing, at said user station, at least one three-dimensional component of said consumer product to have said desired design (Manufacturing Process of utilizing the CAD/CAM to automated machinery to create a real-world part, e.g., col. 6 lines 23-64).

As to claim 15, it is individually similar in scope to claim 2 above; therefore, rejected under similar rationale.

As to claim 16, Khurana in view of Henson teaches the CCPS user station of claim 14, wherein said graphics subsystem comprises a set of predetermined designs and images (see claim 6 above), and a graphics tool for enabling a modification of said predetermined designs and images and for further enabling the creation of new designs and images (the new feature is mounted to the face plane, col. 4 lines 52-65, figs. 1 and 3).

As to claim 17, it is individually similar in scope to claim 3 above; therefore, rejected under similar rationale.

As to claim 18, Khurana in view of Henson teaches the CCPS user station of claim 16, wherein said user interface enables the user to access said graphics subsystem for the purpose of selecting one of said predetermined designs as a desired design (Henson, default display, col. 9 lines 9-24 and fig. 5).

As to claim 19, it is individually similar in scope to claim 5 above; therefore, rejected under similar rationale.

As to claim 20, it is individually similar in scope to claim 6 above; therefore, rejected under similar rationale.

As to claim 24, it is individually similar in scope to claim 10 above; therefore, rejected under similar rationale.

As to claim 25, Khurana in view of Henson teaches the CCPS user station of claim 14, wherein said consumer product is a mobile station (Note the rejection of claim 13 above and Henson teaches a personal computer, col. 3 lines 45-55).

As to claim 26, Khurana in view of Henson teaches the CCPS user station of claim 25, wherein said at least one component is a cover component of said mobile station (Henson, Monitor Choose 92 of fig. 5).

As to claims 50-54, they are similar in scope to claim 26; therefore, rejected under similar rationale.

As to claim 27, Khurana in view of Henson teaches the CCPS user station of claim 25, wherein said user interface further enables a user to at least one of select, modify or create an audible signal for use with said mobile station (Henson, Sound Card and Speakers of fig. 5).

As to claim 28, Khurana in view of Henson teaches the CCPS user station of claim 25, wherein said user interface further enables a user to at least one of select, modify or create a graphical image for use with said mobile station (Henson, chassis, col. 15 lines 31-41).

As to claims 29-34, and 38, they are method claims of system claims 1-6, and 10. Note the rejections of claims 1-6, and 10 above respectively.

As to claims 39-40, they are method claims of system claims 14-15. Note the rejections of claims 14-15 above respectively.

As to claim 42, they are method claims of the system claim 17. Note the rejection of claim 17 above.

As to claims 43-45, and 49, they are method claims of system claims 18-20, and 24. Note the rejections of claims 18-20, and 24 above respectively.

5. Claims 7-9, 21-23, 35-37, and 46-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Khurana et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,735,489 B1) in view of Henson (U.S. Patent No. 6,167,383), and further in view of Squilla et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,288,719 B1).

As to claim 7, Khurana in view of Henson teaches the user inputs a new design or image, but Modified Khurana does not clearly show the inputs by digitally scanning an artwork or a photograph. Squilla clearly teaches a film scanner to scan images (col. 4 lines 35-41). It would have been obvious at the time of the invention that a person with ordinary skill in the art would want to have the Squilla's film scanner in the modified Manufacturing Process Modeling of Khurana to produce a high revolution digital file (col. 4 lines 40-41).

As to claim 8, modified Khurana teaches the user inputs the new design or image, but the modified system does not clearly show the inputs by a digital camera. Squilla clearly teaches a digital camera (col. 4 lines 42-46). It would have been obvious at the time of the invention that a person with ordinary skill in the art would want to use Squilla's digital camera in the modified Manufacturing Process Modeling of Khurana to reduce time in digital process of generating images in comparison to regular chemical processes (col. 4 lines 37-46).

As to claim 9, modified Khurana teaches the user inputs the new design or image, but the modified Khurana does not clearly show the inputs by a memory card. Squilla clearly teaches a memory card for storing images (col. 4 lines 43-46). It would have been obvious at the time of the invention that a person with ordinary skill in the art would want to use highly flexible and compatible of Squilla's memory card in the modified Manufacturing Process Modeling of Khurana to speed up embedding process.

As to claims 21-23, they are similar in scope to claims 7-9 above; therefore, they can be rejected under similar rationales.

As to claims 35-37, they are method claims of system claims 7-9. Note the rejections of claims 7-9 above respectively.

As to claims 46-48, they are method claims of system claims 21-23. Note the rejections of claims 21-23 above respectively.

6. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Khurana et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,735,489 B1) in view of Henson (U.S. Patent No. 6,167,383), and further in view of Chien et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2001/0054003 A1).

As to claim 12, modified Khurana teaches the electronic commerce engine accepts a payment from credit card (fig. 10); however, the modified system does not clearly show a payment from the user in a form selected from the group consisting of a credit card, a debit card, a gift card, and a redemption of loyalty points. Chien clearly teaches a payment from the group consisting of credit card, a debit card, a gift card, and a redemption of loyalty points (page 1 [0008], page 4 [0030], and page 6 [0049]). It would have been obvious at the time of the invention that a person with ordinary skill in the art would want to have a highly flexible payment features of Chien in the modified Manufacturing Process Modeling to give customers more convenience when shopping online.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-40 and 42-49 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Stoll et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,611,730 B1) teaches design, making/manufacturing products, and GUI (col. 8-2-11 and figs. 1-3).

Sebastian et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,822,206) teaches computer-based design system CAD, modules, and template (cols. 5-27 and figs. 2A-4).

Hocaoglu et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,249,714 B1) teaches models, manufacture, designs, and GUI (cols. 4-7, figs. 1-2, and 6).

Matsuzaki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,357,439) teaches customized products, specification, manufacture, and real products (cols. 5-31 and figs. 1, 38D-50).

Wu et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,741,899) teaches CAD and making products (cols. 2-5 and figs. 2-5).

Kai et al. (CAD/CAM/CAE for Ring Design and Manufacture, Computer-Aided Engineering Journal, Feb. 1991) teaches CAD/CAM/CAE and design and manufacturing real products (pages 13-24).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Truc T Chuong whose telephone number is 703-305-5753. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th and alternate Fridays 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather R. Herndon can be reached on 703-308-5186. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Truc T. Chuong

08/20/04

BA HUYNH
PRIMARY EXAMINER